

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

THURSDAY, April 30, 1998

Washington Post

April 30, 1998

Pg. 1

U.S. And China To Seek A 'Strategic Partnership'

By Barton Gellman
Washington Post
Foreign Service

BEIJING, April 29—The United States and China renewed their mutual ambition to build a "constructive strategic partnership" for the 21st century today as Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright began two days of talks to prepare for President Clinton's state visit in June.

At a meeting at the Diaoyutai government fishing retreat, Albright and China's new foreign minister, Tang Jiaxuan, exchanged public compliments and signed a modest agreement establishing a "hot line" linking the White House with China's Zhongnanhai leadership compound. It was Albright's first meeting with Tang.

At a joint news conference, Albright admitted it has "become something of a cliché to marvel at the pace of change in the world," but marvel she might. Almost exactly a year ago, the Clinton administration was picking and losing a fight with China -- for the seventh

straight time -- at the annual U.N. Human Rights Convention in Geneva. Albright vowed then to "continue to shine the spotlight on egregious violations of internationally recognized human rights in China."

Today, after completing a deliberate process of disengaging from confrontation over China's imprisoned dissidents, the United States is preparing for a jubilant state visit in June by President Clinton, the first such visit since China crushed its democracy movement at Tiananmen Square in 1989.

Asked whether the summit might be the occasion for putting the era -- and U.S. sanctions -- occasioned by Tiananmen behind them, Albright said the two countries "still have some differences" despite "a great deal in common." But Tang turned toward her with a smile and a nod as she added, "That is why these dialogues take place, and we are looking towards the 21st century."

Both Tang and Albright referred to a "strategic partnership" between their countries.

"Clearly the U.S. and China

have moved well down the road toward building a constructive strategic partnership," Albright said.

A senior official traveling with Albright placed great value tonight on the secretary's broad "strategic dialogue" with Vice Premier Qian Qichen, a former foreign minister with whom Albright had already formed a bond.

The two leaders, he said, discussed common interests in such former points of conflict as Korea, the Persian Gulf, Cambodia, Indonesia and Pakistan.

China, the official said, is showing signs of growing acceptance of a U.S. regional military presence, which the Beijing government has long resented -- including 47,000 troops in Japan.

"The very interesting thing was what wasn't said, as much as what was -- no references to hegemony, no references to multipolarity, no references to withdrawal of forces in the post-Cold War era," said a senior U.S. government policymaker on Asia. "It's a very

big change in the presentation by those officials."

Behind the scenes, U.S. officials maintained, Albright pressed China on human rights, with a new emphasis on larger numbers of "tier two" political prisoners held on charges such as "counterrevolutionary crimes."

China's two best-known prisoners of conscience, Wei Jinsheng and Wang Dan, were freed and exiled to the United States under a deal -- never acknowledged openly -- in which the U.S. government for the first time withheld its backing from a resolution scoring China at the Geneva human rights conference this year.

Much of the business of Albright's two-day visit is searching for a concrete mark of progress for Clinton to announce in his week-long tour two months from now.

One such proposal was to lure China into new missile controls "in time to be announced during the president's trip to China," according to a

White House Threatens Relief, Defense Bills Over International Funds

Washington Post...See Pg. 2

U.S. Politics Helps NATO Growth Plan

Philadelphia Inquirer...See Pg. 3

Russia's Disarray Brings A Nuclear Risk To The U.S., Study Says

New York Times...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



March 12 memo by Gary Samore, the National Security Council's senior director for nonproliferation.

The deal, first reported in the Washington Times, would have given China a larger share of lucrative U.S. commercial satellite launches in exchange for China's agreement to join fully in the export restrictions of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

But Chinese authorities reacted negatively when Under-

secretary of State John Holum unveiled the proposal late last month. Military officials who follow China closely said they suspect the Beijing government balks at undercutting its high-priority effort to upgrade its own missiles and maintain some forms of cooperation with allies such as Pakistan and Iran.

A second candidate for new agreement in June is trade. Clinton would like another commercial announcement on

the scale of the Boeing aircraft contract accompanying last October's U.S. state visit of President Jiang Zemin.

The administration is also looking for measured progress in the effort to bring China into the rule-setting World Trade Organization -- under strict rules requiring lower trade barriers and laws enabling foreign firms to sell goods and services freely.

Accession to the trade or-

ganization is regarded as a long way off, but some administration officials hope progress is fast enough to allow Clinton and Jiang to declare a political target of a "framework agreement" by the end of the year.

Other working groups accompanying Albright are exploring initiatives on the environment, law enforcement, science and cultural exchanges and the tentative program of military visits already under-way.

White House Threatens Relief, Defense Bills Over International Funds

By Eric Pianin
Washington Post
Staff Writer

The White House yesterday threatened a veto of emergency disaster relief and defense spending legislation even as members of the House and Senate finally managed to work out almost all the differences among themselves.

Although administration officials have said the disaster and defense money is essential, they are insisting that Republican leaders reverse field and include funding for the International Monetary Fund and overdue payments to the United Nations and drop several objectionable extraneous provisions.

After months of internal Republican wrangling, House and Senate negotiators last night worked toward a final compromise on the supplemental 1998 spending bill that would provide \$2.6 billion for El Niño-related disaster relief and nearly \$2.8 billion for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf.

Negotiators completed work on everything except a Republican provision that would provide more than \$2 billion of

subsidies to banks as incentives to continue providing student loans. Rep. David R. Obey (D-Wis.) objected to a proposal for partially financing the plan by selling off \$480 million worth of the government's stockpile of diamonds and other precious minerals.

"Evidently, diamonds are not just girls' friends, they are bankers' friends," Obey said. Republican appropriations leaders dropped that idea, but now must find alternative funding sources.

House Republican leaders insisted on excluding \$18 billion of IMF funding from the bill that had been requested by the administration and approved by the Senate. House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) said yesterday that funding for the international lending agency should clear Congress later this year provided the IMF agrees to tough reforms. The Senate on Tuesday approved separate State Department legislation to authorize nearly \$1 billion of arrearages to the U.N., but the measure also is unacceptable to the administration because of international anti-abortion provisions that were added.

White House Budget Direc-

tor Franklin D. Raines said in a letter to Congress that "it would be disappointing and disturbing if our ability to provide assistance to disaster victims, to support readiness and our troops in Bosnia and Southwest Asia, and to meet our international responsibilities were held hostage to partisan politics in Congress."

Raines also warned that a handful of extraneous amendments -- including a new loophole to Clinton's recent expansion of a ban on the importing of assault-type rifles, "excessive" subsidies to banks providing student loans, and unwanted environmental provisions on construction of a highway in New Mexico's Petroglyph National Monument -- were unacceptable. "If this wide range of extraneous issues is included in the bill, while not funding IMF and U.N., the president's senior advisers would recommend that he immediately return the bill to the Congress without his approval," Raines said.

The Pentagon has said it may have to begin laying off civilian employees Friday if the spending measure isn't passed. But House Appropriations Committee Chairman Bob

Livingston (R-La.) responded to Raines's letter, saying that if the president vetoes the bill, he would have no recourse but to go on the House floor and urge Congress to bring home troops from Bosnia and the gulf.

"That's a tantrum," he told reporters about the White House threat.

As happened in 1997, a relatively straightforward and necessary emergency spending bill has been transformed into a political and ideological battleground between the Clinton administration and the Republican-controlled Congress. But there were also numerous philosophical tensions between House and Senate GOP appropriators and leaders that slowed passage of the bill.

One of the biggest disputes among Republicans was over whether to finance all or part of the legislation with offsetting spending cuts in other programs. House conservatives called for "offsets" for both the domestic and defense spending, while Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) objected to any offsetting cuts in the Pentagon's budget that might further weaken what he describes as a "hollow" military force.

House and Senate negotia-

Washington Post
April 30, 1998
Pg. 13

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

tors compromised yesterday, agreeing to use about \$2.6 billion of unused Section 8 housing subsidy funds to cover most of the cost of disaster relief, while adding to the deficit to finance peacekeeping efforts.

West Confirmed as VA Secretary

The Senate confirmed President Clinton's choice of Army Secretary Togo D. West Jr. to be secretary for veterans affairs. West, a former Army officer who studied law and rose to be the Pentagon's general counsel before becoming Army secretary in 1993, was named to the Cabinet post by Clinton in January.

Washington Post
April 30, 1998
Pg. 10

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 30, 1998

U.S. politics helps NATO growth plan

Expanding into Eastern Europe would please ethnic American voters and defense workers.

By Steven Thomma

INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON — U.S. backing for an expansion of NATO into Eastern Europe — soon to be voted on in the Senate — appears driven as much by domestic politics as international security strategy.

While the White House, senators and experts debate the military or strategic value of expanding NATO, all agree that it is politically attractive at home.

It would please millions of ethnic American voters of Eastern European descent, particularly in political swing states such as Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey and Ohio.

"It is certainly true that this subject is of keen interest in communities here in the United States that have an ethnic identity with these countries," White House spokesman Michael McCurry conceded, while insisting that the NATO expansion would benefit all Americans by making Europe more secure.

And it could help the paychecks of defense workers from Texas to California, whose factories could sell U.S. tanks and jets to the new NATO partners.

Said William Hartung, a senior fellow at the World Policy Institute in New York: "This is really a Marshall Plan for weapons dealers."

The support is also driven by the personal style of President Clinton, a leader who prefers to build consensus on solutions in town-hall meetings and national conversations rather than from the solitude of the Oval Office. He now wants to

extend that style to the world stage with more decisions made in international tribunals and fewer made in Washington alone.

The core decision is whether to add Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which was formed 50 years ago to defend Western Europe against the communist Soviet Union and its allies.

Before the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, it dominated the three countries, and all three are now democracies looking to cement ties to the West and defend against any possible future threat from Russia.

During his 1996 reelection campaign, Clinton proposed expanding NATO even though it would anger Russia. In one appearance before a Polish American group in Detroit two weeks before the election, Clinton said NATO should be expanded by 1999.

Many analysts believe it is a strategically smart move. Noting that Russia remains a potent nuclear military power even if it is no longer communist, Annelise Anderson, a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, called NATO expansion "the right policy."

Diverging interests

"While we have a lot more in common with Russia than we did, our interests on trade, on the economy, are still not the same," Anderson said. "We have differences over which we will clash. ... You evaluate threat according to capability."

But that, critics say, ignores the changes in the world in the last decade and the risk it raises to U.S.-Russia relations by extending a military alliance closer to Russia's border.

"Is there still a massive army poised on the borders of Poland, Hungary or the Czech Republic? I don't see it," said Sen. Bob Smith (R., N.H.). "Tell me where the threat is. Tell me where the urgency is. There is no threat. It is an emotional, feel-good thing to do."

There's no doubt it would feel good to 9.4 million Polish Americans, 1.6 million Hungarian Americans and 1.3 million Czech Americans who actively support the inclusion of their ancestral homes

Pg. 1

in NATO.

Because of those voters, this foreign-relations issue has drawn a surprising amount of domestic political interest. The governors of California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Mexico and Ohio have endorsed it, as have groups ranging from the AFL-CIO to the Slovak League of America.

Polish Americans protest

When Sen. Robert Torricelli (D., N.J.) supported delaying a NATO vote in March, the New Jersey branch of the Polish American Congress organized a protest, and boasted that it represented a million Polish Americans. "We will remember in November," the group warned. Now Torricelli supports the expansion.

So do defense workers.

The new NATO members would aim to dramatically upgrade their militaries, with everything from new tanks to new jets. And that would mean a new market for U.S. workers facing a shrinking Pentagon appetite for new weapons.

"An expanded NATO would bring with it a significant upside for U.S. defense contractors," said Jon Kutler of Quarterdeck Investment Partners, a Los Angeles firm.

Even advocates such as Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D., Md.), who favors the expansion because it "will extend NATO's stabilizing influence to more of Europe and reduce the chances of aggression or conflict in Eastern Europe," adds that "there are also economic benefits."

And to someone like Clinton, there is the benefit of expanding another international organization. Increasingly, he is mediating international problems through such groups rather than acting alone.

When Asia's economies started teetering, he let the International Monetary Fund bail them out. When Iraq refused to let U.N. weapons inspectors into Saddam Hussein's presidential palaces, he held the Navy in check while the United Nations brokered a deal. When Latin American nations complained that the United States was acting arrogantly by "certifying" their anti-drug efforts, he proposed a new international alliance to do the same thing and said he hoped the U.S. law

would become irrelevant.

The way the Clinton administration wants to conduct international policy "is to always work through some kind of international body," said David DeRosa, an adjunct professor of international finance at Yale University's School of Management.

That's not to say the U.S. completely surrenders its role. In fact, it often can lead those international organizations where it wants them to go because it is the world's only military and economic superpower, and because it often is the largest source of money for the groups.

Indeed, Bill Richardson, the U.S.

ambassador to the United Nations, recently told Congress: "We're the most powerful nation in the world. We use the U.N. a lot. The U.N. does a lot of things for us, and when we asked them to reform, we asked them to cut staff, we asked them to run more efficiently, that's good."

Washington Post

April 30, 1998

Pg. 10

NATO Expansion Advocates Fight Amendments

Senate proponents of NATO expansion into Eastern Europe continued to fight off what they regard as troubling amendments yesterday as the Senate headed toward a vote—as early as today—on admission of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the Western military alliance.

Voting 62 to 37, the Senate defeated a proposal by Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Tex.) that would have required the United States to propose creation of a new process to resolve disputes among members as the alliance grows. Opponents contended it would diminish U.S. influence in an existing process requiring consensus in resolving internal disputes.

With a final vote on NATO enlargement anticipated today or early next week, both sides picked up votes from uncommitted senators as Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) said he would vote against it

and Jack Reed (D-R.I.) said he would vote for it. Dale Bumpers (D-Ark.) confirmed his opposition to expansion. Senate leaders have said they believe they have the two-thirds majority needed for approval.

Issues to be resolved before the final vote include proposals for a delay in admission of the three countries until they are admitted to the European Union, a three-year moratorium on further admissions, cost controls and limitations on expanding NATO's mission to include global peacekeeping efforts.

Meanwhile, the Senate debate reached the highest levels in Poland. U.S. Ambassador to Poland Dan Fried was visiting the mountaintop Jasna Gora monastery yesterday when a monk asked if he was there "because you're in trouble on the floor of the Senate," an administration official related. If that was the reason, the monk added, "we're willing to provide a little help."

New York Times

April 30, 1998

Russia's Disarray Brings A Nuclear Risk To The U.S., Study Says

By Tim Weiner

WASHINGTON -- Russia's deteriorating control of its nuclear weapons is increasing the danger of an accidental or unauthorized attack on the United States, a Nobel peace prize-winning group warned Wednesday.

A dozen missiles fired from a Russian nuclear submarine would kill nearly seven million Americans instantly, and millions more would die from radiation, according to a study conducted under the auspices of Physicians for Social Responsibility, which won the Nobel Peace Prize for its work on nuclear weapons in 1985. The study is to be published Thursday in The New England Journal of Medicine.

Thousands of Russian and American nuclear weapons remain on hair-trigger alerts, despite the end of the cold war, and Russia formally abandoned its longstanding policy that it would never be the first nation to use those weapons four years ago, the study noted.

Repeated assurances from President Clinton that the two nations are no longer aiming their nuclear weapons at one another are "a gross misrepresentation of reality," said Bruce

Blair, a co-author of the study and a former Strategic Air Command nuclear weapons officer. In fact, the study said, Russian missiles launched without specific targets would automatically aim themselves at their cold-war targets: American cities and military installations like the Pentagon.

Nor are these weapons necessarily in safe hands. Russia's once-elite nuclear weapons commands are suffering housing and food shortages, low pay, budget cuts, deteriorating discipline, desertions and suicides. Such problems are not unique.

The study says that about 40,000 American military personnel were removed from nuclear-weapons responsibilities from 1975 to 1990 for alcohol, drug or psychiatric problems.

Neither nation has abandoned its cold-war doctrine of launching its missiles after receiving warning that the other side is attacking. Each nation gives itself 15 minutes to decide that the attack is real; both nations have experienced major false alarms over the last two decades.

The study considered what would happen if the captain

and crew of a Russian submarine decided to carry out an attack without authorization, or went mad and fired off their arsenal. This, Blair said, would require "a conspiracy of some magnitude" between a captain and three or four officers.

The missiles could also be fired after a false alarm or an unauthorized order from a political or military leader in Moscow. Once launched, they would reach their targets across the United States in 15 to 30 minutes.

The blast and shock of the fireball from each of the exploding warheads would kill nearly everyone within three miles instantly; people living in a swath up to 40 miles long and three miles wide would receive a lethal dose of radiation within

hours, the study said.

It assumed that one-quarter of the missiles would malfunction, and that 12 missiles carrying 48 nuclear warheads would reach their targets in eight American cities in the middle of the night.

In New York City, more than three million people would die immediately; in San Francisco, 739,000; in Washington, 728,000 -- in all, some 6,838,000 deaths within hours of the attack, the study said, which would "dwarf all prior accidents in history."

A near-complete breakdown of systems delivering food, water, electricity and medicine would follow and millions more Americans would die as a consequence, the study said.

Washington Post April 30, 1998 Pg. 24

38 Dead in Turkish Attacks on Rebels

DIYARBAKIR, Turkey—Thousands of Turkish troops backed by air power have attacked Kurdish separatist rebels in the mountainous southeastern region of the country, military officials said. One official said 35 guerrillas and three soldiers had been killed in clashes since the push against the Kurdistan Workers Party began four days ago.

New York Times

April 30, 1998

New Rumbblings In Cyprus Raise Specter Of War

By Stephen Kinzer

KYRENIA, Cyprus -- A television station in the self-proclaimed Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus scooped the world recently by broadcasting the film "Titanic" to an amazed and delighted audience.

The film is still doing huge business at theaters around the world, including northern Cyprus, and has not been licensed for television broadcast anywhere. Distributors want to sue the station that pirated it but are not sure they can.

"We're an illegal country," a Turkish Cypriot official said, his voice dripping with sarcasm and resentment. "We should be entitled to a little illegal entertainment."

Ever since Cyprus was divided in 1974 when Turkish troops invaded, the north has been isolated. In a series of overwhelming votes, the U.N. Security Council has reiterated its request that Turkey withdraw its troops and allow reunification. But Turkey refuses, saying it fears that the Greek Cypriot majority will overrun the north and destroy its Turkish character.

Bitter intransigence on both sides has frustrated many would-be mediators over the years, most recently Richard Holbrooke, the special Cyprus envoy of President Clinton. He has described the differences between Greek and Turkish Cypriots as much deeper than those that have separated Serbs, Croats and Bosnian Muslims.

Holbrooke's visit here in April, and his planned return May 2, reflected growing concern that this conflict is entering a dangerous new stage.

On March 31, the European Union opened talks aimed at admitting Cyprus. Turks fear it may admit the Greek-run south alone. That could leave the Turkish north and its allies in Ankara to fend off an enemy backed by all of Europe, a potentially explosive situation.

"The Turks were badly treated by the European Union

in December, when 12 countries applied for membership and 11 were told they could apply, with Turkey being left out in the rain," Holbrooke said in an interview. "One of the 11 was Cyprus. That produced an inevitable Turkish backlash, which has resulted in them telling North Cyprus to cease all cooperation, all search for common ground."

"The only way this can be reversed is if the European Union opens its doors at least a little bit to Turkey and treats it as it should be treated, as a European nation. The Turks, for their part, have to ease up on their negative approach in Cyprus."

Also raising tensions, the Greek Cypriots have announced that they are buying a battery of S-300 anti-aircraft missiles from Russia. Turkey, at whose planes they would presumably be aimed, has threatened to bomb them. The Greek government says it would consider that an act of war.

"If Turkey attacks Cyprus, we shall fight," Foreign Minister Theodoros Pangalos said on a recent visit to Washington. "Yes, that will mean war between Greece and Turkey."

For millennia, Cyprus has been a strategic prize guarding access to rich trade routes between Europe and Asia. Greeks have lived here since antiquity.

For nearly a century the island was a British colony. It won independence in 1960 with a constitution that guaranteed the Turkish minority a strong say in government. The Greek majority later curtailed those rights, starting what Turkish Cypriots say was a violent campaign to intimidate them into fleeing. Many can still remember Greek paramilitary units preventing them from leaving their villages to reach their land, go to beaches or attend school.

In 1974, after a rightist coup here engineered by the military dictatorship then ruling Greece,

Turkish Cypriots appealed to Turkey for help. Turkish troops landed, seized the northern one-third of the island and set up a Turkish enclave. The United Nations declared the invasion illegal and refuses to recognize the enclave, which in 1983 declared itself an independent state.

Today the island is home to roughly 200,000 Turkish Cypriots and nearly 600,000 Greek Cypriots. U.N. troops patrol the "green line" that separates them, and the capital, Nicosia, is a divided city.

Nicosia reflects the contrast between the island's sides. The Turkish sector is poor, run-down and frozen in time. On the other side, Greeks run a bustling and successful economy.

Many Turkish Cypriots, however, are convinced that they could not live safely under Greek rule. "We're not doing so badly," said Salahi Dervish, 65, who runs an auto repair shop in Kyrenia. "Of course we don't have much money, but we have enough. More important, we have security."

Greeks assert that Cyprus has always been Hellenic, and that while a Turkish minority can and will be tolerated, Greeks must rule. They apply the term "Kypreos," meaning Cypriot, only to islanders of Greek descent, scorning the idea that anyone with a Turkish background could be a true native. Some favor ultimate union with the Greek motherland, a prospect that is anathema to Turks.

For their part, Turks perceive the island as home to two distinct native communities with equal rights and insist on running their own affairs. They say bombings and attacks by Greek gunmen in the 1960s and early '70s prove that they can never trust Greeks to govern them.

"There were thousands of deaths, and the wounds are very deep," said Osman Ertug, a senior Turkish Cypriot diplomat. "Everyone lost somebody. It becomes part of collective memory."

Greek Cypriots have little incentive to compromise because they already control two-thirds of the island and are recognized by every country except Turkey as its rightful rul-

ers. They are so much richer than the Turkish Cypriots that they could simply buy out the Turks if the island were unified. Perhaps most important, they have the unconditional backing of Greece.

In the chambers of the European Union, Greece has threatened to block the admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and other countries if Cyprus' application is not considered expeditiously.

Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand, are international outcasts, subject to an array of official and unofficial embargoes. Their per capita income is one-third that of Greek Cypriots.

Turkey and northern Cyprus have warned that they will move toward "full integration" if the European Union admits the Greek Cypriot state. But short of complete union, they could hardly come closer than they already are.

The currency of northern Cyprus is the Turkish lira. Its international mail flows through Turkey, and it shares Turkey's telephone code. Turkey maintains 30,000 soldiers here and gives the government about \$200 million in aid each year.

Both Cypriot parties live under the wing of their motherlands, and many foreign diplomats are convinced that answers must be sought not only on the island itself, but in Greece and Turkey.

In both countries, however, many people feel a deep emotional connection to their Cypriot kin. For politicians, advocating serious compromise on Cyprus-related issues is tantamount to suicide. As a result, hard-liners and demagogues dominate the debate.

Last month Greek Cypriot leaders offered Turkish Cypriots a place on the team that is negotiating the island's membership in the European Union. Turks refused on the ground that taking part "under the Greek umbrella" would be accepting a subservient position.

This attitude has upset both Europeans and Americans. "I really feel here that the Turkish Cypriot community is being victimized because of all kinds of political considerations which I feel are withholding

from them a better and more prosperous future," Hans van den Broek, foreign affairs commissioner of the European Union, said in Brussels after the talks began.

The United States is pressing the Greek side to cancel deployment of the Russian missiles, and is encouraging the Turkish side to join in negotiat-

ing Cyprus' entry into the European Union. It has had no visible success.

"The Turks have everything to lose from boycotting the talks," a senior American policy planner said. "If they could get into the EU, even as a minority in a Cypriot delegation, they would become the first Islamic voice in the EU and

also a voice for Turkey. It would be a great step forward, not only for Turkish Cyprus but for Turkey itself."

In interviews, Turkish Cypriots said they were alarmed by developments they interpret as being aimed against them.

"If south Cyprus gets into Europe, that will mean a crack-up is coming," said Mustafa

Ozkal, a Nicosia shoemaker. "The people in the south are doing fine economically, and they aren't trying to get in for economic reasons. They want to get in for political reasons. Their plan is to get all of Europe behind them, and then accuse us of occupying European Union territory and crush us."

Gen. Shelton says military is not a 'hollow force'

BY JIM LEA

Stripes Scout Bureau Chief

CAMP BONIFAS, South Korea — America's top general says he disagrees with people who say extended deployments are reducing U.S. military readiness.

"I'm aware there are a lot of people who feel we're moving back toward a 'hollow force,'" Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Henry Shelton said in an interview at this camp on the edge of Korea's Demilitarized Zone on Wednesday.

"I and most of the senior (military) leaders came up through that hollow force and we recognize it when we see it. We're nowhere near having that today."

He said what he saw in his two-day visit to South Korea "reinforced the fact that our forward deployed (forces), our 'first to fight,' are trained and ready. And we will be for the foreseeable future."

But, he added, there are challenges caused by reduced budgets.

"We have to walk a very delicate line in balancing readiness,

modernization and quality of life," he said.

The latter, he said, "remains very high on our priorities list."

Shelton arrived in South Korea late Monday at the invitation of his ROK counterpart, Gen. Kim Jin-ho, to discuss the security situation on the peninsula with American and South Korean officials.

Shelton said he had discussed the ROK-U.S. military alliance and reaffirmed for his South Korean hosts America's firm commitment to that alliance and to maintaining peace and stability on the peninsula and

throughout the Pacific.

He said he found U.S. and ROK troops "absolutely first class in every respect."

"Living conditions (for American troops) here are harsh, training is tough, family separation is trying at times," he said. "But (the troops) have done an absolutely outstanding job and I've been totally impressed with what I've observed."

On Tuesday, South Korean President Kim Dae-jung presented Shelton with the Order of National Security Merit Tong-il Medal.

Pacific Stars & Stripes

May 1, 1998

Pg. 4

Washington Post

April 30, 1998

Pg. 23

New Sanctions Freeze Assets In Yugoslavia

Investment Ban May Follow In Bid to End Ethnic Violence

By William Drozdiak

Washington Post Foreign Service

ROME, April 29—Seeking to defuse the threat of another Balkan war, the United States and major European powers today decided to impose fresh sanctions against Yugoslavia because of its continuing suppression of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo.

After a marathon meeting that lasted well into the evening, senior officials agreed to an immediate freeze of Yugoslavia's assets to be followed by a ban on foreign investments within 10 days unless Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic withdraws his security police

and opens unconditional talks on Kosovo's future.

In a bow toward European pleas for more positive incentives, the representatives from the United States, Russia, Germany, Britain, France and Italy promised to lift economic sanctions and reintegrate Yugoslavia into the international economy once Milosevic shows greater willingness to cooperate with their demands.

The group said the freeze on assets would be reversed if Yugoslavia accepted outside mediation of the Kosovo dispute by former Spanish prime minister Felipe Gonzalez.

If Belgrade consents to Gonzalez's role, the six nations

said they would promote Yugoslavia's reintegration into international bodies from which it was expelled, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Kosovo is an impoverished southern province of Serbia, the dominant republic of what is left of Yugoslavia. The long-simmering dispute there between its ethnic Albanian majority and minority Serbs erupted in late February when Serbian forces launched a crackdown on Albanian separatist guerrillas. Serbian forces have killed more than 150 people, many of them women and children, in the province in the past two months.

Serbian forces say they are targeting Albanian "terrorists" bent on carving out an independent state in a province that Serbians have controlled for centuries. Kosovo was an autonomous region within Yugoslavia before Milosevic imposed direct rule in 1989.

The laborious compromise reached here tonight only partly concealed the fissures among the six Balkans "contact group" powers about how to deal with the crisis.

Russia refused to endorse further sanctions and dissociated itself from the freeze on Yugoslavia's assets.

The United States had threatened to disband the group and adopt a more independent policy unless the other members endorsed a tougher approach.

But it remained unclear

whether the array of carrots and sticks would persuade the Yugoslav authorities to ease their crackdown against ethnic Albanians, who comprise 90 percent of Kosovo's 2 million people.

At previous meetings in London and Bonn, the six powers prescribed an arms embargo against Yugoslavia and warned that other sanctions would follow unless Milosevic accepted their advice.

But the Yugoslav leader has scorned outside pressure and moved extra security forces into Kosovo.

Reflecting uncertainty within the Clinton administration about the next phase in the

crisis, Robert Gelbard, the chief U.S. mediator for the Balkans who participated in today's meeting, refused to answer questions about its outcome or to comment whether the results were sufficient to avoid an American walkout from the contact group.

French and German participants, however, acknowledged the situation in Kosovo is worsening and there is no clear sign that the group's proposals would elicit greater cooperation from Milosevic.

In recent days, the fighting in Kosovo has intensified and raised fears that the violence could spill over into neighboring Albania and Macedonia --

where many ethnic Albanians also live.

Greece and Turkey, which remain at odds over Cyprus and other sovereignty issues in the Aegean Sea, could also become embroiled in a regional conflict pitting Orthodox Christians against Muslims.

In Kosovo today, Serbian police said they shot to death a guerrilla suspect who fired on them during the funeral of three ethnic Albanians killed this week by the Yugoslav army. Albanian Prime Minister Fatos Nano urged NATO to consider the emergency deployment of troops along the northern border of his country.

Albania accused Yugoslavia

this week of violating its airspace by sending helicopters over the border in hot pursuit of Kosovo separatists -- a charge denied by Belgrade.

The six contact group members say they agree on the goal of persuading Yugoslavia to withdraw its security forces and to open negotiations with Kosovo's Albanian leaders in the presence of foreign mediators.

Milosevic has balked at an international presence, saying that Kosovo is an internal matter. He recently held a referendum in which 95 percent of Yugoslav voters purportedly backed his stand.

New York Times

April 30, 1998

Yet Another Act in the Balkan Tragedy

By Chris Hedges

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia -- At noon a convoy of a dozen cars, carrying men with faces painted black and red, wound its way through the streets of this city. The automatic assault rifles cradled in their arms poked through the windows as stunned onlookers gawked.

"This is a warning that if we continue to ask for independence, we will die," said a 37-year-old woman who watched the cars pass and asked to remain unidentified. "The only thing the Serbs offer us now is terror."

The Balkans have been revisited by the dark specter of ethnic warfare, complete with masked paramilitaries unleashed by the Serbian state and accountable to no one for their actions, Serbian soldiers and policemen who surround villages and blast away with cannon, leaving civilians dead, and a state-run media campaign seemingly intended to whip up hatred among Serbs against another ethnic group. To round off the sadly familiar scenario, European diplomats and Washington are arguing over what to do about a crisis it may be too late to solve.

"The red lights were flashing in Kosovo for a decade," a European diplomat said, "but nobody bothered to act. The situation, as we saw in Bosnia at the start of the war, has deteriorated so rapidly that there

is little, short of outside intervention, that will stop a war. Kosovo is lost."

The Serbian province of Kosovo -- where 90 percent of the 2 million people are ethnic Albanians -- is looking more and more like Bosnia. Serbian policemen in bulletproof vests have set up light machine guns behind sandbags at checkpoints and are often shot at by rebels who sneak down to the roads under the cover of new foliage. Attack helicopters thunder along the rugged, mountainous border with Albania in search of gun-runners and rebel bands.

The rap-rap-rap of automatic-weapons fire punctuates the deathly quiet of the countryside, and there are now roads, including some a few miles from the provincial capital, Pristina, that are too dangerous to travel.

Villages like Prekaz, Broce, Kopiliq, Vojnik, Turicvac, Lausa and Jashanica are marked with gutted, burned and abandoned houses. Ethnic Albanians stand glumly at checkpoints, showing identification papers to the police. Buses and trucks are often stopped and searched, and it is not unusual for passengers and drivers to feel a few blows from the clubs wielded by the police. The police, after demanding to see press credentials from foreign reporters, have been ripping them up, tossing them out and turning

reporters away.

The fighters in the Kosovo Liberation Army, who issued a statement this week denouncing a negotiated settlement of the separatist struggle, saunter through villages with a cockiness, and often belligerence, that borders on the suicidal. As their ranks swell, and as weapons come by pack mule over the border from Albania, there is a dangerous belief among the rebels that an independent Kosovo is just months away. A few days ago, a group of guerrillas sent down a note to the police at one checkpoint daring the Serbs to come and get them.

"We know what we are doing," a rebel fighter on the road near the village of Lausa said. "We are getting fighters with experience into Kosovo. We are getting organized. We will be a real army."

The rebels, who are fighting for an independent state in Kosovo, were a shadowy group whose existence was disputed even a few months ago. But on Feb. 28 the Serbian special police opened a bloody counterinsurgency sweep that left more than 80 dead, at least half of them women, children and the elderly. The attack ignited the current insurrection, driving hundreds of men into the arms of the rebel movement.

The Yugoslav president, Slobodan Milosevic, defying Western calls for military and special police units to be withdrawn, has sent hundreds of reinforcements, along with tanks, artillery and missile

launchers, to the border with Albania. The state-run press is filled with reports of atrocities carried out by ethnic Albanians, many of which appear to be unfounded, and coverage of the attacks against the police. Vecernje Novosti, a daily newspaper in Belgrade, reported Wednesday that several Serbs had been kidnapped near the Albanian border.

In a referendum last week, Serbs overwhelmingly rejected any foreign mediation in the conflict, another blow to international efforts to stop the violence.

The linguistic, cultural and religious differences -- most ethnic Albanians are Muslims -- mean that ethnic Albanians are far more estranged from the Serbs than the Croats and Muslims who inhabit Bosnia and share the language of Serbo-Croatian with the Serbs.

Clashes with the police and military occur daily. Last week 25 ethnic Albanians were killed in a shootout with army troops as they tried to bring in weapons from Albania. Three more ethnic Albanians were gunned down on Monday, bringing the death toll to more than 150 people in two months. After the funeral for the three men Wednesday, witnesses said the Serbian police had fired on departing mourners, killing one man.

Besim Shala, 25, from Broja, 20 miles northwest of Pristina, said he saw his village come under a Serbian grenade attack last week. He fled with his wife, two children and sev-

eral neighbors, one of whom was wounded by a piece of shrapnel. The frightened families hid in the undergrowth until dark.

"I and my two brothers decided to sneak back after the shelling stopped and it was dark to see if our home was damaged," Shala said. "When we got to the house, we saw that our sheds had been flattened and there were huge

holes in the roof. We flicked on a lighter inside the house to see how it looked and immediately the police began to shoot. My brother Avni was badly wounded."

The army, which says one of the men recently captured crossing the border was a former officer in the old Yugoslav army, appears to view most Albanians as "terrorists."

Serbian officials, trying to

defend their harsh tactics, have displayed crates of captured weapons, including 400 AK-47 assault rifles, to reporters and diplomats. Many of the assault rifles were still in the original boxes and covered with the protective grease applied by the manufacturer.

Fadilj Dabicaj, 39, who said he had been captured by the army, told the Serbian television that he, along with 1,000

other volunteers, had received weapons and training at a training camp at Tropoje. He said the camp was commanded by a nephew of the former Albanian president, Sali Berisha.

The Albanian government has denied aiding the rebels, but Belgrade's accusations and threats have grown more heated in recent days and the buildup on the border worries many Western envoys.

Fears Grow For Serb Villagers In Kosovo

London Times

April 30, 1998

By Tom Walker

FEARS are mounting for eight Serb villagers in Kosovo territory controlled by ethnic Albanian guerrillas. Reliable sources said they believed at least two had been killed, but the Kosovo Liberation Army (UCK) yesterday guaranteed the safety of civilians, and demanded its inclusion in peace talks.

In a statement timed to coincide with the mediation meeting in Rome of the six-nation Contact Group for Yugoslavia, the UCK threatened violence for as long as Serb "invaders" were in

Kosovo.

There is growing evidence that the shadowy army has a hardline element from across the border in Albania and that it is prepared to abandon the pacifist policies extolled by the Democratic League of Kosovo (LDK), the main Albanian political party in the province.

"Any agreement without us will not be valid and will be punished," the statement said of peace talks with Belgrade. "We call on the government of Kosovo to give us money for national liberation. Cowards of defeatism and anarchy should leave." The last sentence was said to refer to Ibrahim

Rugova, the LDK leader often likened to Gandhi, who has never admitted links to the UCK.

The missing Serbs live in villages east of the highway from Pec to Dakovica, a triangle of territory surrounded by Serbian police and the Yugoslav Army.

An Orthodox priest in the area, attempting to mediate with the Albanians, said he feared Serbs were being taken to an alleged UCK command centre in the village of Glogjane and being tortured.

"I saw the bruises of one man detained there myself," he said. "It is very worrisome." He

recounted how three brothers returned to the village to find feed for their cattle, only for their house to be surrounded by UCK guerrillas. "They were attacked from all sides," he said. "They were kicked even by their former neighbours."

Reporters who yesterday found tracks circumventing UCK lines of defence were confronted by fighters very different from those nearer the Serb positions. They wore orange-flecked uniforms with black masks bearing the UCK badge and carried new Kalashnikovs. Their accents were said to be typical of northern Albania.

Washington Post April 30, 1998 Pg. 24

N. Korean Calls for Better Ties with South

SEOUL—In a rare public statement, Communist North Korean leader Kim Jong Il has called for improving ties with rival South Korea, the North's media reported yesterday. But Kim insisted that South Korea's capitalist government abolish its national security laws and disband its intelligence agency to make peace with its northern neighbor, a demand already rejected by Seoul.

"We must improve the relations between the North and the South in order to achieve the great unity of our nation," Kim said Tuesday in a statement. "All the Koreans in the North, South and abroad must visit one another, hold contacts, promote dialogue and strengthen solidarity."

It was the first time the reclusive leader had stated a policy toward South Korea since he was elected general secretary of the ruling Korean Workers' Party in October.

Lockheed undercut Boeing on missile

Washington Times
April 30, 1998
Pg. B8

Lockheed Martin's winning bid over Boeing to produce the Air Force's new stealthy cruise missile was about 45 percent lower than the service anticipated, a Pentagon official said.

USA Today

April 30, 1998

Pg. 12

► **DOLE HONORED:** Former Senate majority leader Bob Dole, R-Kan., received the Pentagon's Distinguished Public Service Medal for his heroism and courage as a soldier and civilian. Dole's combat wounds in World War II cost him the use of his right hand.

Inside The Pentagon

April 30, 1998

Pg. 1

Thurmond's Chat Room

The Senate Armed Services Committee will hear testimony from Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre and others in a June 2 hearing on cyber defense, according to a news release from panel chairman Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-SC). The session was prompted by recent reports of successful intrusions into Pentagon computer systems and increasing concern over the Year 2000 date conversion problem. "In the age of the modern battlefield, our forces increasingly rely on information, and it is absolutely critical that we begin to examine how to best protect this critical element of our warfighting ability," Thurmond said. "We cannot accept continued breaches of DOD computer systems due to hackers, or the collapse of DOD's command and control systems because the administration has not taken necessary steps to solve the Y2K."

Creating Professional Bosnian Media

New York Times

April 30, 1998

Bosnia's media, especially radio and television, hold a particular place of infamy in that country. Broadcast propaganda helped foment the ethnic hatred that led to war, and today it is impeding peace and reconciliation.

Most Bosnian press and broadcast media are biased and dreary, controlled by whatever political party holds power. But thanks to funding and training from such groups as the Agency for International Development, the BBC, George Soros' Open Society Institute and various European governments, there are now also independent voices.

The challenge for Bosnia and for the international community is to help keep these new media active after NATO troops leave, and to improve the state television and radio stations that are the main source of news for Bosnians.

Instead of training in English, programs should use experienced journalists who speak the local language and understand local problems.

A new French-financed course to be taught by local journalists is promising.

But training alone is not going to solve the problem of the politicians' hold on Bosnia's airwaves. Licenses are dispensed according to political criteria.

Especially in the Croatian sector, which is controlled by viru-

lent nationalists, some television and radio stations still incite people to block the return of refugees or call those who work with other ethnic groups "traitors."

Bosnia needs the equivalent of a Federal Communications Commission to allocate licenses -- which are public property -- without regard to politics and impose reasonable regulation of the airwaves. But a new proposal by the Office of the High Representative, the international civilian authority running Bosnia, poses potential dangers.

A new temporary media commission will not only give out licenses, it will be able to fine or shut down stations that do not comply with standards the High Representative is drafting.

The commission, like America's system, should be able to cancel or suspend the licenses of stations that broadcast direct incitements to violence if a diligent review process open to all parties establishes a pattern of such abuse. Licensing requirements should include the airing of competing viewpoints. But the commission should not venture further into regulating the content of broadcasting, and should stick to its plan not to regulate the print media. If the commission appears to be imposing Western-backed censorship, it will violate democratic principles, enrage Bosnian citizens and encourage neighboring dictators to strengthen their hold on the media.

Just Say No

Long Island Newsday

April 29, 1998

Pg. 48

The Senate Seems Intent On Expanding NATO, A Provocative Act That Should Be Rejected.

The Senate is now debating seriously and at some length one of the most important foreign policy decisions this nation has faced in years: whether to expand NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. Nothing said in the debate has changed this page's opinion that expanding NATO is a fundamentally wrong choice.

If you want to appreciate just how wrongheaded the entire effort is, consider what Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.) told the Senate: that Russia doesn't really mind NATO's expanding toward its borders. Opponents have pointed out to Biden that such hard-liners as former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union George Kennan, the father of containment; Jack Matlock Jr., a Reagan-era ambassador to the Soviet Union; and hard-line guru Richard Pipes, a key adviser to Ronald Reagan on policy toward the Soviet Union, all say this move is viewed as a serious threat by Russians. Biden should at least be honest and admit NATO expansion is an "in your face" gesture to Moscow. And then he should explain why it makes any sense to take such an approach to Russia at this point in history.

The opposition has also correctly asked where this policy will lead. If NATO expansion stops after encompassing these three nations, won't a new line dividing Europe have been drawn? And if expansion continues, does anybody really believe the Russians will gracefully accept NATO's burgeoning to its borders? And what will that expansion do to the need for cooperation between Russia and the United States on issues such as control of nuclear arms and handling of regional disputes, like those in the Balkans and the Persian Gulf?

Every indication is that the Senate will give this treaty amendment the necessary two-thirds majority it needs for ratification. Expanding NATO is politically popular even if it doesn't make sense from the perspective of U.S. interests. The arguments in favor of expansion have been generally slogans about the need to stabilize the new democracies in eastern Europe or prevent future conflicts there. But New York's Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan warns that NATO expansion will only increase Russia's reliance on nuclear weapons. How is that in anybody's interest?

Boston Globe

April 29, 1998

Pg. 23

Worse Than The Missile Gap

By David Nyhan
Globe Columnist

Fifty Scud missiles adapted to spread anthrax. Plus 2,100 gallons of the deadly germ warfare agent. Toss in a shade under four tons of VX, a dreadful nerve gas close to what terrorists briefly sowed in Tokyo subways.

This is the kind of stuff Saddam Hussein's government lied about, then owned up to owning. You know there's more and worse stuff hidden in the so-called "presidential pal-

aces."

Those palaces are not Balmoral Castle or Windsor, the turreted theme park tucked atop a hill surrounded by shops and theaters in suburban England.

The Iraqi dictator's hideouts "could be several hundred buildings" all told if he ever stops adding on to them, in the estimate of Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen. And these hiding places for devilish weaponry amount to "monuments to the most extreme kind of egocentrism there is."

A century that closed the

bloody books on Hitler, Stalin, and Pol Pot winds down with a disheartening potential for widespread use of chemical and biological weapons, "the weapons of the future" now that some sort of rough stasis exists in nuclear weaponry.

While the media were obsessing on Paula-Monica-and-whomever, the serious work of government ground on. And President Clinton's recent bedside reading, Cohen said in a recent interview, included a scary novel called "The Cobra Event," by Richard Preston, who also wrote "The Hot Zone" about an Ebola virus outbreak.

A part-time novelist in his own right, Cohen said Clinton was stunned by "Cobra" and its explication, using previously classified material, of just how vulnerable modern societies are to cheap, hard-to-detect lab-produced weapons of mass destruction.

On the morning of April 10, when the news industry was throwing its typical hissy fit about what went on, or didn't go on, when the door to the Oval Office swung shut, the president's Cabinet met on a more serious item of public business.

"Pretty threatening" is how

Cohen reprised the briefing the executive branch's top people received. They heard a crash course in how easy it is to manufacture, buy, hide, or employ chemical and biological weapons. "Devastation can take place in such a short time," said Cohen later that morning. "It should frighten anyone."

In March, without public notice, about 40 top US government officials took part in a mock war game. The exercise supposed that mythical terrorists spread a hybrid biological warfare agent resembling smallpox along the Mexican border.

Thousands of hypothetical citizens died; the news triggered panic along the border. Hospitals were overwhelmed. The response of law enforcement, the military, public health officials, and politicians was confused, hesitant, inconsistent, and in some cases

counter-productive.

It showed that the United States is not ready to defend its population against any of the new horrors of the postnuclear age. And the exercise got Clinton's attention, even if much of the media and the scandal-absorbed public dwell on less substantial fare.

Bacteria like anthrax can be "the weapon of the future," admitted Cohen, whose job it is to keep our borders intact and our citizens safe, not just here, but everywhere else he can reasonably project America's military might.

For openers, Clinton demanded that the military come up with some kind of quick-response team, and the policy is now laid down. Ten different National Guard units around the nation will be designated as "first responders," meaning that when some kind of unidentified

stink bomb goes off somewhere, these specially trained citizen-soldiers will be activated and dispatched.

There have been enough movies and TV shows on the theme of the Blob from Outer Space that Americans are used to having the dickens scared out of them. Cohen's chore is to ratchet up public awareness to the point where that translates to congressional approval of cash for containing this kind of threat.

The way it works in D.C. - whether Congress is run by Republicans or Democrats, the game's the same - is that the dough goes to the squeakiest wheel. So if a certain kind of military airplane is built in Newt Gingrich's Georgia neighborhood, we buy hundreds of these particular airplanes, whether the Air Force wants them or not.

And since Senate majority

leader Trent Lott's favorite charity is the shipbuilding outfit in his state of Mississippi, the Navy gets all kinds of floating machinery built in Mississippi, whether the admirals want the damn things or not.

Since the only guy we know for sure stockpiling anthrax hangs out in Iraq, it's not yet clear from what quarter the anthrax-fighting lobby will emerge. But you can be sure that if the pot gets sweet enough, the anthrax busters will have an army of Guccishod sweet-talkers greasing the ways for bug-busting.

But it is hard to get the media's attention long enough to make the argument that a can of anthrax poses a lot more of a threat to the republic than Bill Clinton's libido.

David Nyhan is a Globe columnist.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram

April 29, 1998

Closing Bases

Defense Secretary William Cohen has tossed a new suggestion into the lingering controversy about future rounds of military base-closings.

Pleading once again last weekend for Congress to plan a round of base-closings for 2001 and another in 2005, Cohen attempted to shortstop the usual congressional unhappiness about President Clinton's political tinkering with the process in 1995-96, attempting to sway voters in Texas and California by interfering with plans to close bases in those states.

Cohen advised Congress to remove the president (it wouldn't be Clinton in 2001, anyway) from the equation by "rewriting the rules."

Cohen is focused, once again, on the money that could be

saved (\$21 billion, he says) by closing redundant bases -- bases kept alive by Congress mostly because they provide jobs in this or that congressional district although they may not be needed for the nation's defense. That money, he says, could be directed instead at new military hardware and weapons systems (Joint Strike Fighters, new aircraft carriers, surface ships, helicopters) to keep America's forces a step ahead of any potential foe.

Amid a certain amount of pain, the base closings of 1991 and 1993 worked. The vibrant economy has helped soften the blow for affected communities. The base-closing machinery -- originally suggested by Rep. Dick Armey, R-Texas, more than a decade ago -- removes most of the politics.

Cohen's challenge to a reluctant Congress is to remove more politics and use base closings to get on with the job of modernizing America's armed forces despite budget restraints.

Washington Times

April 30, 1998

Pg. 19

Missing missile defenses

MONA CHAREN

In times of peace and prosperity, it is difficult to focus people's minds on seemingly distant threats or dangers. For a few brief hours last month, we thought we had detected a potentially catastrophic meteor heading Earth's way, but that turned out to be a false alarm. Had our meteoric menace been real, it would certainly have

given a boost to space-based defense funding. But now, we've returned to our sleepy complacency.

There are other dangers out there. They don't grab headlines like an intergalactic stalker, but they could threaten huge numbers of Americans with nuclear, chemical and biological death.

Most Americans are under the comforting misimpression that the United States already has the means to defend itself against ballistic missiles. When Gen. Charles Horner, former head of U.S. Space Command, took visitors on tours of Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado, most were surprised to learn that the United States has the capacity to detect a missile launched at our country but absolutely no ability to stop it. Our only option is that of retaliation.

When President Ronald Reagan proposed an anti-missile defense system to protect the American population in the 1980s, he was met with disdain and furious opposition from the Democratic Party and the opinion elites. His idea was scorned as needlessly provocative as well as technically impossible. What Mr. Reagan called the Strategic Defense Initiative was immediately caricatured and dismissed as "star wars."

When the Soviet empire collapsed in the early 1990s, the Bush administration scaled back funding for anti-missile defenses, focusing only on battlefield systems such as the Patriot missile, which was deployed (rather unsuccessfully, as it turns out) against Iraqi Scuds in the Gulf war.

But while the Soviet Union is gone, the threat from missile attack is not. As former CIA Director R.

MARY McGRORY*Two Schools of Thought*

James Woolsey put it on a videotape distributed by the Center for Security Policy, "It's as if we'd been in a 45-year struggle with a dragon. We have killed the dragon and now find ourselves in a jungle full of poisonous snakes. In a way, the dragon was easier to keep track of."

And Mr. Woolsey is specific. Who are the snakes? "Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Hezbollah, Om Shimriku." All of these nations and groups, with technical help and materiel from Russia and China, have well-developed missile programs. Iraq and Libya, of course, are seeking to acquire every weapon of mass destruction they can lay their hands on.

We continue to stand naked before missiles launched by any aggressor, as well as those launched accidentally. And we do so as a matter of national policy.

Since the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 1972, it has been official U.S. policy not to defend our population against missile attack. The doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction was our shield.

Whatever the merits of that approach during the Cold War (Mr. Reagan found it immoral), we are now living by a treaty signed with a nation that no longer exists.

Moreover, as a front-page story in *The Washington Post* makes clear, the investment in missile defense technologies has taken us seven-eighths of the way down the road to a deployable system. We need only to finish the job. "There are no more scientific unknowns from this point," Shell Wald, a Raytheon weapons specialist, told *The Post*. "It's just a matter of straight engineering. We are so close. I could taste it. It's no longer a question of if, but when."

When, though, is a political question, not a military or technological one. The Clinton administration would prefer to rely on arms-control agreements, like the Chemical Weapons Treaty, and limits on technology transfers. (Though the recent decision by the president to approve the transfer of missile guidance technology to China, against the advice of the Pentagon, would seem to vitiate that claim.)

Treaties have never inhibited aggressors in the past and will not do so in the future. By not moving forward on missile defense, we are wasting the billions already invested and failing the American people.

Mona Charen is a nationally syndicated columnist.

The Washington of the somebodies and the Washington of the nobodies were much on display last weekend. The somebodies—beginning with the president—gathered at the White House Correspondents' Dinner, a delirium of glitz and din with Paula Jones at the heart of it wearing a dress that belied her yearning to be taken for "Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm."

Some of the other women attending the summit of spinners and spun were overdressed, others unnervingly under-dressed. Hollywood, which feels a deep kinship with the Clinton White House, was much in evidence. Star-gawking by and of the powerful was the recreation while the goal, as always, was the pursuit of power.

The next day's action was in Lafayette Park and it couldn't have been more different. These people were not trying to open doors like the folks at the Hilton dinner, they were trying to shut a school, a hideous relic of the Cold War called the School of the Americas. Its graduates have participated in the worst murders, slaughters and atrocities in Central America for 20 years. The gathering, convened by the School of the Americas Watch, was liberally sprinkled with seniors and people wearing jeans or habits, the livery of those seeking justice.

They had conscientiously counted themselves—1,350, they said, and there was no counter-report from the police. They listened with aching attentiveness to dozens of speeches made by unknown orators. Alan Nairn, a writer and activist, brought them to cheers with his call for truth commissions in Guatemala, Honduras and other luckless recipients of the savageries of Fort Benning graduates. The leadership of SOA Watch was depleted. Father Roy Bourgeois, its famous director, is once again in jail, this time for criminal trespass on government property last November. Watch office director Carol Richardson is also in prison for the same offense. Her daughter, Heather Dean, carried on, armed with three clipboards and a head full of murderous alumni names.

The commander in chief would have been better off in the park, hearing things that might have stiffened his spine to stand up to the Pentagon for once. At his party, he made a brittle speech. To his credit, he did not end with the customary flourish about the wonder of

fraternization between hunters and prey. Instead, he praised Helen Thomas, who got an award for being a fine reporter and authentic human being. The first lady got her first standing ovation from the press—for showing up after five hours of interrogation by independent counsel Kenneth Starr. The buzz was about her chances of not being indicted.

In the park, there was raging conviction. These people, many seniors among them, were ready to go to jail for their belief that School of the Americas is a Cold War leftover that makes us the ally of torturers, rapists and killers. Last year, they came within four votes of winning in the House. A last-minute push from the Pentagon saved the school. Unexpected names were among the ayes, none more conspicuous than Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.), a tireless champion of human rights on every issue from right to life to Tibet. He said he was persuaded by a House Appropriations staff that proposed a new curriculum.

"They deserve another chance," says Wolf. "If we don't tell them about human rights, how will they know?"

Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer of the University of St. Thomas in Minnesota, said he thought the self-sacrifice of older religious has its effect. He has written a book called "School for Assassins" and he thinks the contrast of blameless seniors doing time while the U.S.-trained perpetrators of mass murder and torture are still free is bound to get to the taxpayers. Take 70-year-old Sister Rita Steinhagen of Minneapolis and the order of St. Joseph of Carondelet, who is in a federal pen and a heroine in her town.

Sister Rita's sisters were part of the entertainment, a guerrilla pageant, with gigantic figures on stilts, wearing grotesque masks, acting out the atrocities. The sisters sang a haunting requiem as the coffins were carried off.

Rep. Joe Kennedy (D-Mass.) still leads the fight against the school. He recently called Father Bourgeois in jail. He was in handcuffs; someone had to hold the phone for him. He was in the hole for refusing to work.

Of course the larger crime was the Reagan policy of "Better dead than red," with Elliott Abrams of the State Department defending Salvadoran death squads. While the demonstrators were on the Hill on Monday, word came that a Guatemalan bishop, Juan Gerardi

Conedera, who had just completed a report on human rights abuses in his country, had been brutally murdered. It was another reminder that what Central Americans don't need is more "training" of a military that thinks anything is justified in the name of the status quo.

Wall Street Journal

April 30, 1998 Pg. 1

Mandela named Gen. Siphwe Nyanda, a former guerrilla leader, as South Africa's first black military chief. His predecessor, a white holdover from the apartheid era, quit recently after Mandela rejected an army report saying Nyanda was plotting a coup.

Israel formally opened the celebration of the 50th anniversary of its founding, with security tight and Palestinians barred from entering. Meanwhile, Arafat accepted a U.S. proposal for an Israeli pullout from about 13% of the West Bank, putting pressure on Netanyahu before London talks next week.

Dallas Morning News

April 30, 1998

Bioterrorism

Though probability seems low, U.S. should be prepared

A recent drill conducted by officials in Washington suggests that terrorist bombs may be child's play when compared to the introduction of germ warfare. And the danger soars when Washington's lack of foresight is taken into account.

"There is still no overarching federal blueprint for response," says Richard A. Falkenrath, executive director of the Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University. "What you have now are mostly grass-roots efforts springing up in a wide range of agencies."

That's incredible. But now that new lessons have been learned in a "what if?" scenario that posited biological warfare along the U.S.-Mexico border, the government must take new steps. Against the backdrop of Pan Am 107, deadly sarin gas attacks on the Tokyo subway and the devastation achieved at the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City, it would be foolhardy to assume that germ warfare will never occur.

President Clinton reportedly is about to issue two new "presidential decision directives" to guard against chemical, bio-

logical or cyberweapon attacks on the United States. That's a start. But while he's at it, he should name a national anti-terrorism coordinator to monitor interagency disputes that could turn deadly in real life.

Even more horrifying than the loss of thousands of lives, an incident of germ warfare could trigger social breakdown and economic meltdown. That's why the government should not hesitate to begin implementing these measures, among others:

- Beef up local capacity to respond. Keep an updated list of trained medical personnel who could be immunized and sent into an infected community to render aid. Stockpile the capacity to produce antidotes, vaccines and antibiotics.
- Implement a system that helps ensure that other countries are complying with a 1972 treaty banning biological weapons.
- Address the difficult question of quarantine laws and regulations throughout the United States.

The allure of terrorism lies in its ability to instill fear through a single bloody act. Yet biological terrorism that can victimize thousands over a prolonged period of time could destroy a nation's resolve much more effectively.

If the merchants of a new form of terror are to be discouraged, it is up to the federal government to demonstrate its readiness for the worst that evildoers can concoct.

Washington Times

April 30, 1998

Pg. 18

Achilles heel of the military

HARRY SUMMERS

In its drive to prepare for the battlefields of the 21st century, the U.S. military may be unwittingly exposing its Achilles' heel to our adversaries. This could prove fatal, for the search for such a vulnerability is at the heart of military strategy.

In Homer's "Iliad," Paris, the son of the Trojan king, discovered that Achilles, the invincible Greek warrior, had a vulnerable spot. When Achilles was an infant, his mother had dipped him into the river Styx to make him immortal, but she'd neglected to submerge the heel by which she held him. An arrow to that heel brought him down during the Trojan War.

The great military theorist Carl von Clausewitz called such points of vulnerability "centers of gravity," and "the hub of all power and move-

ment, on which everything depends [and] the point against which all our energies should be directed." Tangible centers of gravity, he said, include the enemy's army, the army of his protector and his capital city. Destroy or capture them, and if they are indeed true centers of gravity, victory will be at hand. Intangible routes to victory include the community of interests among alliances, the personalities of the leaders and public opinion.

It was the intangible of public opinion that proved to be America's Achilles' heel during the Vietnam War. Ironically, this had been our strength during World War II, when the entire country mobilized for war. But in Vietnam, we made a conscious decision not to do that. "Since we wanted to limit the war," wrote Secretary of State Dean Rusk, "we deliberately refrained from creating a war psychology in the United States. We did not try to stir up the anger of the American people over Vietnam. This may have been a mistake."

It was the single greatest mistake of the war. Influencing public opinion is an American forte, with Madison Avenue's ad campaigns the envy of the world. Yet, by default, we were beaten at our own game. We didn't send movie actors around the country, whipping up enthusiasm for the war, said Rusk.

But North Vietnam put movie star Jane Fonda in the gunner's seat of an anti-aircraft gun in Hanoi to whip up enthusiasm for their side.

As social critic Tom Wolfe put it, "If the United States was seriously trying to win the battle of world public opinion — well, then you had a real bush-league operation. The North Vietnamese were the untested aces."

Turning an enemy's strength against him is not uncommon, for as Clausewitz noted in one of his most profound axioms, "In war the will is directed against an animate object that reacts." The first reaction to an enemy strength is the search for ways to combat it; the greater the strength, the more intense the development of countermeasures. Thus, too great a reliance on a particular strength can create its own Achilles' heel, a phenomenon that may be happening in America today.

Information Age technology has taken the lead as our military prepares for the 21st century. Space platforms, computers, digital communications and other electronic warfare advances have revolutionized the battlefield. Only partially applied during the Gulf war, the technology enabled U.S. commanders to get inside the enemy's decision-making loop and paralyze his

battlefield reactions. All the armed services are deeply involved in Information Age technology, and the Army now has a test-bed digital division at Fort Hood, Texas.

But what happens if those electronics "crash"? You can be sure that all of our potential adversaries, and not a few of our erstwhile "friends," are working on radio frequency weapons to make just that happen. "We will have an electronic Pearl Harbor if we do not accept a wake-up call," said retired Army Lt. Gen. Robert L. Schweitzer before a Joint Congressional Committee last year.

And if that were not disturbing

enough, another wakeup call was sounded last week, when it was revealed that a team of international hackers had broken into the Pentagon's computer system that coordinates the military's Global Positioning System used to pinpoint exact locations, plot field artillery firing sites and target missiles, and had stolen some of its software, which they threatened to sell to terrorist groups. It was the most dangerous attack on the military's electronic infrastructure so far.

Three decades ago, the Army's Counterintelligence Corps cautioned new agents that "absolute security spells absolute immobili-

ty." That CIC warning is particularly relevant in the Information Age, for the whole value of these electronic systems depends on quick and easy user access. How to do that without creating an Achilles' heel our enemies can exploit has become the great conundrum of the Information Age.

Harry G. Summers Jr., a retired U.S. Army colonel, is a distinguished fellow of the Army War College and a nationally syndicated columnist.

At Tomb of the Unknowns, war's toll may gain a face

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 30, 1998

Pg. 19

By Joe Williams

The stone inscription on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery reads, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known only to God."

It is beginning to appear, however, that the Unknown Soldier who represents America's doomed effort in Vietnam may not be so unknown after all.

Recently, a Pentagon panel recommended that the remains of the Vietnam War soldier interred since 1984 in the Tomb of the Unknowns undergo DNA testing to see whether the soldier is actually Air Force Lt. Michael Blassie, missing since a 1972 aircraft crash over An Loc.

CBS News, which broke the story, has alleged that military officials in the 1970s tentatively identified the remains as Blassie's.

Indeed, the state of record-keeping and forensic medicine during the Vietnam era resulted in the positive identification of nearly all soldier remains. That was certainly a blessing in most ways, but it presented a difficulty to authorities under pressure to find the body of an unidentified American soldier to inter in the Tomb of the Unknowns.

It was allegedly this pressure that led authorities in 1980 to withdraw the provisional identification of the remains and reclassify them as unknown.

Since then, refinements in DNA technology have made it possible to

determine positively whether these remains are those of Blassie.

This ability raises a further intriguing possibility: that the remains of other soldiers in the Tomb of the Unknowns might also be identifiable — if not immediately, perhaps sometime in the future.

The growth in medical technology and the development of databases related to tissue typing and transplant technology might well mean that the DNA of other unknown soldiers could someday be matched to that of their direct descendants.

Some might suggest that, because we are opening the tomb anyway, we should go ahead and take DNA samples from the remains of the other three soldiers interred there — representatives of World Wars I and II and the Korean War.

In the case of Blassie, the original tentative identification — and the possibility that it was ignored for the sake of expedience — present compelling reasons to open the tomb and test the remains. Otherwise, a shadow would remain perpetually over the monument, clouding its meaning.

But to proceed beyond that point in pursuit of some kind of ghoulish Ripley's *Believe It or Not* medical detective story would serve only to desecrate the greater purpose of the tomb — symbol since 1921 of homage to those who laid down their lives for a nation and the ideals it strives to represent.

Blassie's family has requested the

return of the remains, if they are proved to be his. But the meaning of that second burial, if it occurs, would be far different from that of his first.

It is hard — even impossible — to imagine that Blassie can ever be interred in another ground with a fraction of the profound solemnity that attends the marble site in Arlington, flanked by neoclassic columns and patrolled day and night by an elite military honor guard.

Indeed, we have no other monument that so movingly juxtaposes the somber authority of the United States with the evidence of the sacrifice that made that authority possible.

And that second ceremony would be tempered by the regrettable circumstances that made it necessary.

Although military authorities, resourceful as usual, have said they have other "unknown" remains to place in the tomb if necessary, they might do well to remember the current case and be absolutely certain that any new unknown remains are indeed unknown.

This entire episode suggests that we are probably at the end of the era of unknown soldiers.

And when soldiers are no longer disposable commodities but real, identifiable human beings with families and pasts, lives and loves, the act of sending them into danger's path — always a difficult decision — will, of necessity, take on a new gravity.

Yes to NATO

Richmond Times Dispatch
April 30, 1998
Pg. 18

The debate regarding NATO expansion has prompted thoughtful — and foolish — arguments from both sides.

Although the Clinton administration is the prime mover of the change, it has fallen to Senators — notably Democrat Joseph Lieberman and Republicans Richard Lugar and Jesse Helms — to make the principled case for including Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic in NATO. John Warner makes the principled case against expansion.

As several previous editorials have noted, the question is almost too close to call. But when the pros and cons are tallied, the *ayes* have it.

Troubling questions include: Who will bear the added costs? Do the U.S. and the other old-line NATO members have the *will* to defend the new members? Yet via expansion NATO, the most successful and enduring Free World alliance *ever*, would place Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic firmly where they want to be — and where they belong: among the nations dedicated to defending liberty. Lieberman says: "These countries are knocking on the door of the family of freedom. After all those years of living in effective slavery, they've turned to us [saying], 'We have the opportunity to express our national will, to be free.'" NATO expansion also would remind an America periodically tempted by isolationism that it cannot withdraw.

Some critics oppose the move because it could antagonize Russia and encourage Russians nostalgic not for Communism necessarily but for Empire. The mischievous forces indeed exist. But the threat would persist even if NATO disappeared. Moreover, an enlarged NATO will remind all parties — Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, the traditional NATO members, and Russia itself — that there is no going back.

NATO has expanded before. Spain, for instance, joined after it embraced democracy. Is the door that opened for Spain to be closed to the former satellites? The only legitimate alternative to expansion is abolition. If countries liberated in part because of NATO are to be shunned, then there's no point in maintaining NATO. For decades the West said to the victims of Communism, "Keep the faith. We're with you. This outrage will not last."

The faith was kept; the fences fell, and the wall. NATO played a central role. If NATO is to continue to play that role then it must be a NATO not only open to new members but a NATO altered by their presence. Expand NATO? *Yes* — with this condition: If (1) expansion proves too costly, and (2) raises strategic issues it can't resolve, then the U.S. should move to abolish an alliance whose resistance to change will have suggested its obsolescence.

USA Today

April 30, 1998

Pg. 6

ISRAEL BAILS OUT SPY: Israel paid nearly \$2 million in bail for one of its intelligence agents arrested by Swiss officials during a bungled spy operation. The agent was one of five caught trying to bug an apartment block in a Bern suburb in February. The operation was part of an Israeli mission

against Hezbollah, an Iran-backed guerrilla group. The agent, who was not identified, returned to Israel last weekend after the government put up bail and guaranteed he would appear for trial in Switzerland. Israel has apologized to the Swiss for the incident. The other four operatives were released after questioning.

Journal of Commerce
Apr. 30, 1998 Pg. 6

Restructure NATO or drop it

BY ANTONIN RUSEK

As Congress debates the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's merits this week, the organization must answer three questions to justify its existence: Who is the threat? What is the threat? How does the alliance cope with those threats?

The answers are very important for the United States — especially the American taxpayer — because America still supports most NATO costs and mission capabilities.

Who is the threat? The importance of NATO's former main theater of operations — northeastern and east-central Europe — has essentially vanished and is of declining importance. Russia is still weak.

Energy is the future name of the game, and most global energy resources are in the crescent from the Persian Gulf to Central Asia.

Access to these resources is a matter of life and death for the United States and Western civilization in general. And this access is threatened by three factors: Chinese expansionism, Islamic fundamentalism and Balkan chaos fomented by rogue states like Serbia.

The nature of the threat is to deny the United States and the West access to energy resources.

What is the threat? Today nobody in the world threatens the United States or its NATO allies with conventional military force. The greatest danger is denied access to the global economy and resources.

The global economy, fed by new technologies, instant information and global resource uses, defines what we are today. While knowledge in the global economy becomes universal, however, wealth does

not. Globalization is the advent of a new age of plenty for some, but the collapse of a familiar social order for others.

Human activities are becoming transnational. But that means a new threat: individuals and groups, rather vaguely connected to an established political order, seeking goals — economic, political, social — that are hostile to our perception of civilization. Many of their activities are criminal, such as the use of terrorism, biological agents, disruption of global electronic and information networks. They aim to destroy the source of strength of present civilizations: wealth based on a global economy.

NATO fails to cope with any of these threats. Its European members refuse to participate in activities outside Northern Europe. Even in vital areas like the Balkans, the United States is left effectively alone. Although Turkey and Israel are U.S. allies and irreplaceable if access to energy resources is to be preserved, they are intentionally left out of the European economic integration and even criticized for their decisive stand against international terrorism and the Islamic fundamentalist onslaught.

Existing NATO structures, both political and military, are incapable of coping with these challenges. NATO in its present form has outlived its usefulness. Its victory in the Cold War was magnificent, but it happened seven years ago. Today's NATO serves U.S. national security interests only marginally, mostly as a refueling point and troop staging area. It has become an enormous drag on U.S. resources desperately needed elsewhere to meet power projection and war technology challenges in the future.

In the interest of U.S. national security and taxpayer dollars, NATO should be either substantially restructured to meet present and future challenges, or abandoned.

Antonin Rusek is associate professor of economics at Susquehanna University in Selinsgrove, Pa. This article was distributed by Scripps Howard News Service.

Washington Times

April 30, 1998

Pg. 17

Embassy Row

by James Morrison

NATO, yes or no

Two new views on the NATO debate offer supporters and opponents something to think about.

Paul Goble, a former Soviet specialist in the Bush administration, challenges those who argue the expansion of the alliance will threaten Russia. He says that adding new members, while dealing with Moscow as an observer at NATO headquarters, will actually offer stability to Russian reformers.

Former Ambassador Jonathan Dean argues for a moratorium on new membership, fearing that virtually every country in Europe will want to join the alliance and force the United States to rely on nuclear weapons to deal with an "uncontrollable expansion of U.S. security commitments."

Mr. Goble and Mr. Dean join the debate this week as the Senate is considering adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the alliance.

"Neither side in this ongoing debate has acknowledged that the expansion of the Western alliance . . . may ultimately bring the greatest benefits not so much to the new members but to Russia itself, the country that some people suggest the alliance is still directed against," Mr. Goble, deputy director of Radio Free Europe, wrote this week in a piece distributed by the news service.

Russia is already benefiting through its new charter with NATO, signed last year, that assures Moscow's views will be heard in future NATO decisions, he said.

"The new Russian presence at

alliance headquarters in Brussels means that the alliance itself has been transformed even before it has expanded," he wrote.

With the inclusion of former Soviet satellites, NATO will block Russian extremists from trying to reverse the democratic gains made in former Russian republics and former Warsaw Pact countries since the collapse of the Soviet Union, he said.

Mr. Goble concludes that the "chief beneficiaries of the alliance's . . . expansion will be Russian reformers."

Mr. Dean, now representing the Union of Concerned Scientists, argues that the danger of the expansion is that it will not stop with the first round.

Mr. Dean, who served as U.S. envoy to NATO-Warsaw Pact force reduction talks from 1978 to 1981, yesterday called for the defeat of the NATO enlargement treaty or, at least, the adoption of an amendment to set a three-year moratorium on further expansion.

"The most risky and costly aspect of the NATO enlargement project is the open-ended U.S. defense commitment it involves," he said in a statement.

Mr. Dean noted that after the first three new members, eight other countries want to join in a future round of expansion. Conceivably, he argued, more than 20 other countries could seek NATO membership, including nations in Central Asia and the Caucasus.

"Many of these countries border on Russia [and] could be defended only with nuclear weapons. This would mean an enormous, nearly uncontrollable expansion of U.S. security commitments," he said.

"This entire project, with all its risks and costs, is unnecessary."

Washington Times

April 30, 1998

Pg. 12

INSIDE THE RING

by Ernest Blazar

The diplomat

Sen. Jesse Helms, North Carolina Republican, pulled no punches Monday when he stood in the Senate chamber in support of bringing Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into an expanded North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Cold War-winning military alliance.

First, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman knocked down the suggestion that, instead of NATO, the three Eastern European nations ought

first to join the European Union.

"With all due respect to our friends in Europe, the European Union could not find its way out of a wet paper bag," the senator said.

Next, he said an expansion of the military alliance is needed because the United States needs more, dependable allies. This became clear to him during the armed standoff with Iraq earlier this year.

In stark contrast to the three prospective NATO members, who quickly pledged their support for U.S. military strikes, if needed, Mr. Helms observed, "many of our current NATO allies stuck their heads in the sand and wig-

gled their fannies."

NATO dissenters

While this week's Senate debate wound inexorably toward a yes vote on whether to add Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the NATO military alliance, nearly lost amid gales of speechifying were the voices of two foreign-policy giants.

George Kennan, intellectual architect of America's Cold War policy of containment, recently wrote of NATO expansion: "A process has now been put in motion that can hardly be stopped until NATO has come to take in practically all of Europe except the Balkans, at the risk of making itself a dangerous absurdity rather than a meaningful alliance."

Paul H. Nitze, a former deputy secretary of defense and foreign policy expert, wrote to Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York Democrat, last Friday, "In the present security environment, NATO expansion is not only unnecessary; it is gratuitous. If we want a Europe whole and free, we are not likely to get it by making NATO fat and feeble."

Crimson slide

On Nov. 19, 1997, Russia tried to launch a test version of its newest submarine-launched ballistic missile, known in the West as the SS-NX-28. It is being built for installation aboard the Borey, Russia's next class of ballistic-missile-carrying submarines. The first of seven Borey-class ships, the Yuri Dolgoruki, is due to enter the Russian fleet no earlier than 2004.

But according to a Pentagon official, the test-flight ended in a "catastrophic failure." It is apparently not an isolated problem because the rest of Russia's submarine program is faring not much better.

Today, Russia still wields 24 nuclear-powered submarines able to fire ballistic missiles at the United States. That's down from about 63 such boats — called "boomers" — held by the Soviet navy just nine years ago. And intelligence experts predict the numbers will continue to shrink.

By 2010, Russia will possess only about 10 such boats, according to intelligence estimates. By comparison, the United States has 18.

Though smaller in number, Russia's missile-carrying submarines are growing in importance to Moscow's military strategy. That is because atop these submarine-based missiles almost two-thirds of Moscow's strategic nuclear weapons will reside. Today, only one-third of Russia's long-range nuclear bombs are aboard submarines.

Despite being Russia's key nuclear platform into the next century, the Borey missile submarine program is starved for funds.

"The missile will be ready before the platform," confirmed and intelligence official. "The platform has problems." Consequently Russia must resort to installing the SS-NX-28 missile aboard an older, "Typhoon"-class boomer for testing until the Yuri Dolgoruki enters the fleet.

Like the United States, Russia fields another kind of submarine: the nuclear-powered hunter-killer attack boat. Instead of lofting

missiles at faraway enemy nations as do "boomers," these stalk and attack enemy ships and submarines.

Today, Russia has only 33 attack boats in service. That represents a steep decline in numbers. Only nine years ago, the Soviet navy had about 137 such undersea craft. The U.S. Navy is building down to 50 attack boats by next year. U.S. intelligence experts predict today's fleet of Russian attack boats will keep shrinking until it reaches 25 by 2010.

What Russia has done is retire all but the most modern and quiet of its submarines. Many of the decommissioned boats are merely tied to quiet piers, their nuclear power plants unrecycled. So neglected are they that some have sunk at their berths.

Still sailing in the attack-boat fleet are mostly Akula-class and Oscar II-class, additional units of which are still under construction. But they also are plagued by a money shortage. In 1997, no work was performed on the Oscars and Akulas still being built. However, this spring, U.S. intelligence officials noticed that some shipyard activity has resumed.

Coming behind the Akulas and Oscars is the Severodvinsk, Russia's newest nuclear-powered attack submarine. Though expected in the Russian fleet no earlier than 2002, the boat faces trouble. Again, the cause is no surprise, said an intelligence official. "We are expecting [its fleet delivery] to slow down based on the availability of rubles."

• Ernest Blazar can be reached at 703/486-3949 and by e-mail (blazar@twtmil.com).

Baltimore Sun

April 30, 1998

Pg. 2

Report criticizes VA for delays in exams of gulf war vets' kin

The Veterans Affairs Department has been slow and ineffective

in carrying out a program to examine the health of the spouses and children of Persian Gulf war veterans, according to a congressional report being released today.

The General Accounting Office, the investigative wing of Congress, said that at the beginning of this year the VA had completed only 872 of 2,802 requests for medical

examinations. The examination program began in November 1994 and expires at the end of this year.

Thousands of veterans returned from the 1991 war with hard-to-diagnose health problems, and many have said their spouses and children have since come down with similar maladies.

Baltimore Sun

April 30, 1998

Pg. C2

Lockheed, partners learn today who gets missile shield contract

The Pentagon will choose today between Boeing Co. and a joint venture of Bethesda's Lockheed Martin Corp. to oversee the effort to assemble a national shield against ballistic missile attacks.

The National Missile Defense "lead systems integrator" contract is worth a potential \$2 billion over the next several years, and ul-

timately far more if the Pentagon decides in 2000 that the system is feasible to use.

Lockheed Martin has joined with Raytheon Corp. and TRW to form United Missile Defense Co. to pursue the contract. Most experts give their partnership the edge over Boeing, which has less experience in related programs.

Navy To Test New Air Defense System Prototype*By Frank Wolfe*

The Navy is preparing to test a new system to allow ships to assess air defense capabilities theater wide and rapidly replan their air defense efforts.

The service will test a prototype of the Applied Physics Laboratory-built Area Air Defense Commander (AADC) in Fleet Battle Experiment Charlie, the third in a series of exercises to explore new weapons systems and technologies.

Ships from the USS *Dwight D. Eisenhower* (CVN-69) battle group are taking part in the exercise which will last from May 1-11 off the coast of North Carolina. The Eisenhower is scheduled to deploy soon to the Persian Gulf as the likely replacement for the USS *Independence* (CV-62).

The new air defense system is designed to integrate theater wide sensor information from a variety of inputs, including the Raytheon-built Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC), data from airborne early warning aircraft and land based radars. Additionally, for the exercise, two simulated cruisers will generate ballistic missile tracks and transmit them to the system.

AADC "will allow us to coordinate between the regions and prevent any unnecessary use of weapons and help deconflict the operations of multiple regions," said Capt. Zack May, the project officer for Fleet Battle Experiment Charlie.

The system is funded for installation on 12 Aegis cruisers, including the first this year, the Navy said. But for the exercise, joint forces will man the system at APL in Maryland.

The system provides rapid theater wide situational awareness for senior commanders through three-dimensional depictions of the battle space and is capable of executing 56 billion instructions per second, the Navy said.

During early stages of a conflict, a coherent theater air picture is necessary for senior commanders, May said. The AADC system "gives us additional planning tools to best position all of our defensive assets and look at potential holes in our defensive laydown," he said. "Right now it takes quite a while. Now, as we add and subtract potential locations, we can rapidly adjust the plan."

The system will "accurately model the impact of terrain, weather and other warfare activities while being able to capture the stationing and intent of units ashore," the Navy said.

Changing air defense plans--in the event of a cruiser or land based missile battery being destroyed, for example--will now take minutes, rather than days or hours, May said.

In the past, crews would have to use charts to assess whether replacement combat air patrol (CAP) stations, land based missile batteries or cruisers could provide missile defense coverage. "The AADC system internally wargames and provides you with real time assessment of the capability of your new force laydown," May said.

In Fleet Battle Experiment Charlie the Navy is also to test a new surface fire support system, the Land Attack Warfare System, built by Interactive Television Co. of Reston, Va. The system is designed to improve the synchronization and speed of naval land attack from multiple ships and aircraft. The system is to permit the Navy to hasten the planning and execution of rapid calls for fire.

San Diego Union-Tribune

April 29, 1998

All Finalists For Napalm Job Drop Out

By L. Erik Bratt
Union-Tribune Staff Writer

SAN DIEGO -- The three other finalists for a Navy contract to dispose 23 million pounds of napalm stored for 25 years in Fallbrook have dropped out of consideration, which means the government has fewer options for getting rid of the flammable substance.

Pollution Control Industries in East Chicago, Ind., was one of four bidders selected by the Navy for a contract to dispose of the napalm, left over from the Vietnam War. PCI was awarded a \$1.7 million contract, but bowed out earlier this month in the face of political

and community pressure.

"Of the final four, we picked PCI," said Robin Yocum, a spokesman for the Navy's prime disposal contractor, Battelle Memorial Institute's laboratory in Richland, Wash. "My understanding is that the other three were no longer interested."

Yocum said he did not want to discuss why the companies no longer sought the contract. The names of other finalists were not released, but sources said they are located in Texas, Missouri and Tennessee.

Jeanne Light, a Navy spokeswoman in San Diego, said she had not heard whether the other finalists had bowed

out.

"I have not talked to him (Yocum) about that," she said. "They are supposed to be talking to those people directly, we are not."

Light said the Navy is still reviewing its options about how to dispose of 23 million pounds -- just over 3 million gallons -- of napalm that has been stored outdoors in aluminum canisters at the Fallbrook Naval Weapons Station since the 1970s. She said it likely will be a few weeks before a decision is made.

PCI was supposed to mix the napalm with other waste for use as fuel in cement kilns in the Midwest. A 12,000-gallon

shipment had been dispatched to PCI on a train on April 11, but it was forced to turn around after the company said it would refuse to accept it.

The shipment is now sitting in a storage yard at China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, in the Mojave Desert 75 miles east of Bakersfield. The rest remains in Fallbrook in 500- and 750-gallon canisters.

Battelle has had at least 50 phone calls from companies and individuals expressing interest in getting rid of the napalm, but only one of them was able to take it immediately, Yocum said.

Washington Post

Clinton News Conference Today

President Clinton has scheduled a news conference at 2 p.m. today, his first formal, solo news conference of the year. He has had joint news conferences this year with British Prime Minister Tony Blair at the White House and with South African President Nelson Mandela in Cape Town.

April 30, 1998

Pg. 10

The president planned to make a statement about the pending Senate vote on NATO enlargement and to praise the booming economy, aides said. He was then to take questions from reporters in the White House East Room, spokesman Michael McCurry said yesterday. White House officials made it clear that Clinton would not have much to say about the ongoing investigation by independent prosecutor Kenneth W. Starr.

Group wants Special Forces to open flying jobs to women

By Amee Seabolt
Washington bureau

WASHINGTON — A Pentagon advisory group is calling for the military's elite forces to open their aviation ranks to women.

In addition, the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services wants the Pentagon to devise a standard policy on fraternization and three military services to maintain basic training that integrates men and women.

The committee plans to recommend that aviation jobs in Special Forces be opened to women as well as positions on Multiple Launch Rocket Systems and in submarines. Committee officials said they want military leaders to justify why those positions remain closed to women.

The problem is that the current restrictions seem to be nothing more than a replacement for the Risk Rule that was rescinded in 1994, committee members said.

The rule prevented women from serving in combat units that could engage in direct combat.

After it was rescinded, Pentagon officials spelled out the restrictions for women with the Direct Ground Combat Definition and Assignment Rule.

Under the rule, women are eligible for all positions except those below the brigade level whose primary mission is direct combat on the ground. This generally means they cannot be a part of infantry, armor or artillery units. Only submarines and certain small combat ships in the Navy remain closed to women.

However, committee members said the rule falls short. In turn, the committee will urge the Pentagon to review the policy to determine what jobs and units could be

opened to women.

Shortcomings in the rule also were cited in a study by the Rand Corp.'s National Defense Institute last fall. It said only 815 women filled the 47,544 new combat related jobs created by Congress in 1994.

The study said there were several problems that seem to account for the low numbers. Researchers for the study interviewed 500 people in focus groups and surveyed 1,000 men and women.

Despite the setbacks, Elizabeth Bilby, the committee's chairwoman, said during an interview Friday that some gains had been made. For the first time, five women have been picked to command combat ships in the Navy, she said.

"That's progress," Bilby said. "But we also need women to get experience earlier in their careers."

The panel issued its rec-

ommendations during a meeting April 21-26 in Reston, Va. It will send them to Defense Secretary William Cohen.

Committee officials said the recommendations are based on comments made by men and women during visits to about 60 military installations, including nine training bases.

The committee is charged with tracking how troops, especially women, feel about their service and military policies. The committee was created in 1951 and meets in the fall and spring.

During recent installation visits, senior committee officials said they were told by troops that a department wide policy on fraternization is needed.

The change would allow troops to clearly know what the limits are, one official said. With clear limits set, troops would be able to congratulate or counsel lower ranking people without fearing reprisal or an unjust claim.

"Troops should be able to

pat each other on the back and do their jobs without it being a problem," Bilby said.

Mary Wamsley, vice chairwoman of the forces development and utilization subcommittee, said men and women also feel strongly about the type of training their service offers.

"The servicemembers I have spoken to passionately believe in gender-integrated training," Wamsley said in a telephone interview Sunday. "If it is a Marine, they are committed to the way their service trains. If it is someone who is from another service, then they believe in the way that service trains."

By endorsing integration, the panel is opposing the recommendation issued in December by a special Pentagon report. That study called for men and women to be segregated more often in basic training to improve their ability to wage war. The Marines Corps is the only service that segregates its troops in basic training.

Washington Post

April 30, 1998

Pg. 19

A Ski Gondola, A Marine Jet And Damages

By Bill McAllister

An Oregon lawyer who became friends with Italian merchants during a recent skiing sabbatical in Italy has been hired by several businesses there to press claims against the U.S. government over the Marine jet accident at a skiing resort in the Alps. Twenty people plunged to their deaths Feb. 3 after the low-flying jet clipped the cables supporting their gondola car.

N. Robert Stoll, a partner of Stoll, Stoll, Berne, Lokting &

Shlachter of Portland, Ore., in turn hired D.C. lawyer Michael D. Hays, a partner at Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, to lobby on behalf of the Italian companies. The cable car company, Funivie Alpe Cermis, and resort hotels in the Cavalese area are expected to seek reimbursement from the U.S. government for the accident involving a Marine EA-6B Prowler. Crew members have denied that they flew under approved minimum altitudes.

Stoll, a key lawyer in the environmental litigation that followed the 1989 Exxon Val-

dez oil spill in Alaska, picked Hays because the two had worked together previously.

"There is no dispute about the fact that this was the fault of our government," said Hays, noting that the military is prosecuting the plane's crew. "The U.S. government said they were going to take responsibility, but now all we get is excuses."

Hays said the small skiing community has been "devastated" by the crash. The gondola car was the main means of transporting skiers to the slopes.

Warring Afghan factions agreed to set up a governing commission of religious scholars, a move the U.N. representative to peace talks hailed as a "fantastic success." Formation of the commission has been a critical issue in the negotiations now under way in Pakistan, the first in two years.

Wall Street Journal
April 30, 1998
Pg. 1

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)